REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated October 10, 2008. Claims 1, 8, 20, 27, 28, and 47 have been amended. Claims 15 to 19, 32 to 46 and 51 to 56 stand withdrawn. No new matter has been added by any of these amendments. Please charge deposit account number 02-1818 any fees which are due in connection with this Response.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1 to 4, 8 to 11, 20 to 23, 25 to 28 and 47 to 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over "The Price is Right Dice Game" archived web page of http://gscentral.net/dice.htm, (8-22-2004 downloaded from http://web.archive.org/web/20040822075604/http://gscentral.net/dice.htm on 8-19-2007, hereafter referred to as "Dice Game") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,406,369 to Baerlocher, et al. ("Baerlocher I") and further in view of European Patent No. EP0945837 to Thomas, et al. ("Thomas"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection.

It appears that the Office Action intended to include U.S. Patent No. 5,788,573 in the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection stated above. Specifically: (i) Page 4 of the Office Action stated, "The applicants' prior art (102(b)) teaches a TV game show implemented as a bonus game on a wagering device (U.S. patent 5,788,573 A) which would suggest taking a TV game show such as the Price is Right Dice Game and making it a bonus game on a wagering device" and (ii) Page 9 of the Office Action stated "regarding the new limitation of Claim 20, this is still obvious in light of '573." According to MPEP 706.02(j), this rejection is improper as U.S. Patent No. 5,788,573 was not positively included in the statement of rejection.

Specifically section 706.02(j) of the MPEP states:

[w]here a reference is relied on to support a rejection, whether or not in a minor capacity, that reference should be positively included in the statement of the rejection. See *In re Hoch*, 428 F.2d 1341, 1342 n.3 166 USPQ 406, 407 n. 3 (CCPA 1970).

[i]t is important for an examiner to properly communicate the basis for a rejection so that the issues can be identified early and the applicant can be given fair opportunity to reply.

If the Examiner deems it necessary to issue another Office Action on the merits of the claims, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide an upcoming non-final Office Action so that Applicant be given a fair opportunity to reply.

During a telephone call on January 12, 2009 with Applicant's representative, Examiner Hoel clarified that U.S. Patent No. 5,788,573 should have been included in the statement of rejection. Accordingly, Applicant will proceed as though U.S. Patent No. 5,788,573 ("Baerlocher II") was included in the above stated 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection.

Dice Game discloses a game where a player rolls a die for each digit in the price of a car. If a player rolls the die and the value on the die equals the value of the corresponding digit in the price of the car for that roll, the digit in the price of the car for that roll is automatically displayed and the player moves on to the next digit. If the player rolls the die and the value on the die does not equal the value of the corresponding digit in the price of the car for that roll, the player must guess if the value on the die is higher or lower than the value of the corresponding digit in the price of the car for that roll. If the player correctly guesses higher or lower, the corresponding digit in the price of the car for that roll is displayed and the player moves on to the next digit in the price of the car. If the player incorrectly guesses higher or lower, the game ends. Every digit in the price of the car must be displayed to the player for the player to win the car.

Baerlocher I discloses "[a] gaming device having a bonus scheme wherein the player takes part in a contest or competition, the success of which determines the player's bonus award". The Office Action relied on Baerlocher I for disclosing a gaming device including a display device and controller.

The Abstract of Thomas discloses:

[a] bonus game for a slot machine operable in a basic mode and a bonus mode. The bonus game is entered upon the occurrence of a special start-bonus game outcome in the basic mode. In the bonus game, a player selects, one at a time, from an array of windows each associated with a bonus game outcome. Credits are awarded based upon which ones of the windows are selected. The bonus game ends upon selection of a window associated with an end-bonus outcome but otherwise continues,

allowing the player to make further selections and accumulate further credits until encountering an end-bonus outcome...

The Office Action relied on Thomas for disclosing a gaming device that displays each of the component symbols for each play of the game. For example, paragraph 41 of Thomas discloses:

[w]hen the bonus game has ended, the game program causes the display to reveal the outcomes associated with the entire grid 40, thereby permitting the player to see which ones of the remaining windows contained end-bonus outcomes and which ones of the window contained "safe" outcomes.

The Abstract of Baerlocher II discloses:

[a] computer implemented electronic game includes a wheel of fortune game with odds of a jackpot greatly in excess of the number of indicia on a simulated wheel. In one embodiment, a virtual mapping allows a bonus indicium of the wheel to be given a 1:M chance of being landed on, even though the bonus position is one of N positions on the simulated wheel. A random number L is chosen between 1 and M and this number is mapped to a number between 1 and N. The display of the wheel if controlled to simulate stopping of the wheel at the indicium where L is mapped to I. In one embodiment, by using successive wheel spins, the odds of moving to the next round are multiplied to achieve an overall odds of winning a jackpot. In one embodiment there is a 1:50 chance of entering a bonus screen from a main slot machine/phrase completion screen, a 1:20 chance of landing on a bonus position in a first wheel spin, a 1:40 chance of landing on a bonus position for a second wheel spin and a 1:200 chance of landing on a bonus position for a last wheel spin to provide an overall odds of a jackpot of 1:8 million.

The Office Action relies on Baerlocher II for implementing a TV game show as a bonus game on a wagering device and for disclosing component symbols being randomly selected by the gaming device.

Independent Claim 1 is generally directed to a gaming device which includes, amongst other elements, at least one memory device which stores a plurality of instructions, which when executed by at least one processor, cause the at least one processor to operate with at least one display device and at least one input device, for each play of a game, to: (a) select one of a plurality of component symbols; (b)

designate one of a plurality of prediction symbols;(c) display the designated prediction symbol to a player; (d) change a first modifier based on the displayed prediction symbol; (e) change a second, separate modifier if the prediction symbol matches the selected component symbol. If the prediction symbol does not match the selected component symbol the at least one memory device which stores a plurality of instructions, which when executed by at least one processor, cause the at least one processor to operate with at least one display device and at least one input device, for each play of a game, to: (i) form at least two symbol sets based on the prediction symbol, wherein one of the symbols sets includes the selected component symbol; (ii) enable the player to input a prediction of which formed symbol set includes the selected component symbol; (iii) display the selected component symbol to the player; (iv) change a third, separate modifier if the player correctly picked which symbol set includes the selected component symbol; and (g) repeat steps (a) to (f) until each of the component symbols is displayed, wherein for each change of said first modifier said first modifier is changed regardless of whether said prediction symbol matches said selected component symbol and regardless of whether the player correctly picked which symbol set includes the selected component symbol; and (h) cause an award to be provided to the player, the award based on the first modifier, the second modifier and the third modifier.

Pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action stated that:

[d]ice game teaches...(d) change a first modifier based on said displayed prediction symbol (thousands place revealed to player if dice matches digit for that price Page 2, the digit is a X1000 modifier since it is a thousands decimal place in the price of a car, in this case the 3 would have been revealed to the player in the thousands position if the car were in the $3,000 to $3,999 range, but it was not so in this case the player had to select higher or lower than three and correctly selected higher so a four was shown in the thousands place; in the example of Page 2 the prediction symbol or dice correctly predicted the component symbol or 6 in the tens place to the player did not have to select higher or lower); (e) change a second modifier if said prediction symbol matches said selected component symbol (process repeated and hundreds place revealed to player if dice matches digit for that price Page 2)... (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the interpretation of the Office Action. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended certain of the claims for clarity. Applicant submits that neither Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, or Baerlocher II nor any gaming device resulting from any combination of Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, and Baerlocher II anticipates or renders obvious, for each play of a game, repeating steps (a) to (f) until each of the component symbols is displayed, wherein for each change of said first modifier, said first modifier is changed regardless of whether said prediction symbol matches said selected component symbol and regardless of whether the player correctly picked which symbol set includes the selected component symbol. Applicant submits that Dice Game discloses changing a modifier based on the number displayed on the die (interpreted by the Office Action as the prediction symbol of amended independent Claim 1) if the number displayed on the die matches the value of the digit in the price of the car (interpreted by the Office Action as the component symbol of amended independent Claim 1) which corresponds to that roll. In other words, in Dice Game, if the number displayed on the die does not match the value of the digit in the price of the car which corresponds to that roll, a modifier does not change based on the number displayed on the die. Thus, the gaming device resulting from the combination of Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, and Baerlocher II does not anticipate or render obvious, for each play of a game, repeating steps (a) to (f) until each of the component symbols is displayed, wherein for each change of said first modifier said first modifier is changed regardless of whether said prediction symbol matches said selected component symbol and regardless of whether the player correctly picked which symbol set includes the selected component symbol. On the other hand, the gaming device of amended independent Claim 1 includes, amongst other elements, at least one memory device which stores a plurality of instructions, which when executed by at least one processor, cause the at least one processor to operate with at least one display device and at least one input device, for each play of a game, to repeat steps (a) to (f) until each of the component symbols is displayed, wherein for each change of said first modifier said first modifier is changed regardless of whether said prediction symbol matches said selected component symbol and regardless of whether the player

correctly picked which symbol set includes the selected component symbol. Moreover, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the gaming device resulting from the combination of Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, and Baerlocher II to result in such a gaming device without reasonably being construed as improper hindsight reconstruction.

Page 5 of the Office Action stated that:

[r]egarding the new limitation of displaying each of the component symbols for each play of the game, such a limitation is obvious over "Dice Game and '369 in light of '837...It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied such a display on each play of the game as taught in '837 to "Dice Game"...This modification would do the same thing in the event of losing outcomes in which the player did not correctly guess all of the digits in the cars price, so the complete price would be displayed in every event of the "Dice Game," whether winning or losing. (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that simply displaying all of the digits in the cars price is dissimilar to repeating a process, as disclosed in the gaming device of amended independent Claim 1, until each of the component symbols are displayed such that for each play of the game, each of the component symbols are displayed to the player. Thus, Applicant submits that neither Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, or Baerlocher II nor any gaming device resulting from any combination of Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, and Baerlocher II anticipates or renders obvious a gaming device that, for each play of a game, selects one of a plurality of component symbols, designates one of a plurality of prediction symbols, displays the designated prediction symbol to a player, and repeats these steps until each of the component symbols is displayed.

Additionally, Applicant submits that neither Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, or Baerlocher II nor any gaming device resulting from any combination of Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, and Baerlocher II anticipates or renders obvious a gaming device that selects and displays a prediction symbol for each component symbol for each play of the game. In other words, regardless of whether the gaming device resulting from

the combination of Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, and Baerlocher II anticipates or renders obvious displaying each of the digits in the cars price after the player loses the game, such a combination does not anticipate or render obvious that, for each play of a game, a prediction symbol is displayed for <u>each</u> of the displayed component symbols. That is, in the event that the game ends before each component symbol is displayed, a player of the gaming device resulting from the combination of Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, and Baerlocher II does not continue to roll the die (i.e., interpreted as displaying a prediction symbol) for the remaining digits in the cars price (i.e., interpreted as the component symbols) that have not been displayed. On the other hand, the gaming device of amended independent Claim 1 includes, amongst other elements, at least one memory device which stores a plurality of instructions, which when executed by at least one processor, cause the at least one processor to operate with at least one display device and at least one input device, for each play of a game, to: (a) select one of a plurality of component symbols, (b) designate one of a plurality of prediction symbols, (c) display the designated prediction symbol to a player…(g) repeat steps (a) to (f) until each of the component symbols is displayed. That is, for the gaming device of amended independent Claim 1, <u>for each play of the game</u>, a designated prediction symbol is displayed for each selected component symbol. Moreover, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the gaming device resulting from any combination of Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, and Baerlocher II to result in such a gaming device without reasonably being construed as improper hindsight reconstruction.

Page 4 of the Office Action stated:

> [d]ice game teaches…and (h) provide the player and award based on said first modifier, said second modifier and said third modifier (game repeated until all digits are revealed and prize awarded to player <u>in the event the player got all of the digits right</u>, Pages 2 and 3). (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that Dice Game does not anticipate or render obvious a gaming device which, <u>for each play of a game</u>, causes an award to be provided to the player, the award based on the first modifier, the second modifier and

the third modifier. Rather, Dice Game discloses "one mistake and the game is lost" (page 1, paragraph 1). Thus, in Dice Game, if the game is lost, the player does not win the car. Accordingly, Applicant submits that neither Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, or Baerlocher II nor any gaming device resulting from any combination of Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, and Baerlocher II anticipates or renders obvious a gaming device which, for each play of a game, causes an award to be provided to the player, the award based on the first modifier, the second modifier and the third modifier. Moreover, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the gaming device resulting from any combination of Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, and Baerlocher II to result in such a gaming device without reasonably being construed as improper hindsight reconstruction. On the other hand, the gaming device of amended independent Claim 1 includes, amongst other elements, at least one memory device which stores a plurality of instructions, which when executed by at least one processor, cause the at least one processor to operate with at least one display device and at least one input device, for each play of a game, to (h) cause an award to be provided to the player, the award based on the first modifier, the second modifier and the third modifier. That is, for the gaming device of amended independent Claim 1 the player is provided an award for each play of the game regardless of whether the player incorrectly guesses higher or lower.

The Response to Arguments section on Page 20 of the Office Action stated:

[r]egarding the applicants' remarks on Page 25, the claim language does not appear to limit the selection of the value to only one criterion as cited in the applicants' specification.

Applicant respectfully clarifies that it was never stated that the claim language limits the selection of the value to only one criterion. Rather, in the Response to Office Action dated July 24, 2008, Applicant was merely illustrating that Dice Game, as it is being interpreted in the Office Action, has two possible criteria for changing each digit in the price of the car and that the three modifiers of amended independent Claim 1 each change based on only a single criteria.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 1 is patentably distinguished over Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, and Baerlocher II and is in condition for allowance.

Amended independent Claims 8, 20, 25, 27, 28, and 47 each include certain similar elements to amended independent Claim 1. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to amended independent Claim 1, amended independent Claims 8, 20, 25, 27, 28, and 47 (and dependent Claims 2 to 7, 9 to 14, 21 to 24, 26 and 29 to 31, 48 to 50) are each patentably distinguished over Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, and Baerlocher II and are in condition for allowance.

Additionally, amended independent Claim 20 is generally directed to a gaming device including, amongst other elements, at least one memory device which stores a plurality of instructions, which when executed by at least one processor, cause the at least one processor to operate with at least one display device and at least one input device, for each play of a game, to randomly select a plurality of component symbols from a plurality of symbols, and for each selected component symbol to: (a) designate one of the plurality of symbols as a prediction symbol, (b) display the designated prediction symbol to a player, (c) cause an award to be provided to the player, the award based on the selected component symbol and one of a plurality of different modifiers if the prediction symbol matches the selected component symbol, wherein each time the prediction symbol matches the selected component symbol the award is based on a different one of the modifiers. If the prediction symbol does not match the selected component symbol the at least one memory device which stores a plurality of instructions, which when executed by at least one processor, cause the at least one processor to operate with at least one display device and at least one input device, for each play of the game, to randomly select a plurality of component symbols from a plurality of symbols, and for each selected component symbol to: form at least two symbol sets based on the prediction symbol, wherein one of the symbol sets includes the selected component symbol and each of the symbol sets include zero, one or a plurality of said symbols, display the symbols from the symbol set including the selected component symbol; enable the player to try to pick the selected component symbol by

picking one of the displayed symbols, display the selected component symbol to the player; and cause the award to be provided to the player if the player correctly picked the selected component symbol.

Pages 8 and 9 of the Office Action stated:

[a]s outlined regarding Claim 1, '369 and Dice Game teach a gaming device comprising...(d) if said prediction symbol does not match said selected component symbol...(ii) display the symbols from the symbol set including the selected component symbol; (iii) enable the player to try to pick the selected component symbol by picking one of the displayed symbols;...

Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that neither Dice Game nor Baerlocher, nor the combination of Dice Game and Baerlocher I anticipates or renders obvious a gaming device wherein if the prediction symbol does not match the selected component symbol, display the symbols from the symbol set including the selected component symbol and enable the player to try to pick the selected component symbol by picking one of the displayed symbols. As previously discussed in the Response to Non-Final Office Action dated August 27, 2007, and the Response to Office Action dated July 24, 2008, Applicant re-submits that the gaming device resulting from the combination of Dice Game and Baerlocher I only enables a player to make a higher or lower selection. That is, the gaming device resulting from the combination of Dice Game and Baerlocher I merely enables a player to select either: (1) a set of numbers that are higher in value than the number displayed on the die; or (2) a set of numbers that are lower in value than the number displayed on the die. Applicant submits that the gaming device resulting from the combination of Dice Game and Baerlocher I does not enable a player to select a specific number from among a set of numbers. It appears that the Office Action has also combined Dice Game and Baerlocher I with Baerlocher II to result in a gaming device, wherein component symbols are randomly selected by the gaming device. Specifically, Pages 9 and 10 of the Office Action stated:

Regarding the new limitation of Claim 20, this is still obvious in light of '573. Figs. 1 and 2 of '573 disclose the slot spinning and the letters from the winning paylines being matched to the Wheel of Fortune bonus game (esp. steps 114, 116, 118, 122 of Fig. 1). This is and example of the

component symbols being randomly selected by the gaming device instead of by the player as cited in Claim 1. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to make this modification to "Dice Game" as it would allow the game to be implemented as either a base game or a bonus game.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that neither Dice Game, Baerlocher I, or Baerlocher II individually nor any gaming device resulting from any combination of Dice Game, Baerlocher I, and Baerlocher II anticipates or renders obvious a gaming device wherein, for each play of the game, if the prediction symbol does not match the selected component symbol, display the symbols from the symbol set including the selected component symbol and enable the player to try to pick the selected component symbol by picking one of the displayed symbols. Applicant submits that Baerlocher II merely discloses that if a winning combination is displayed along a payline, the computer determines if any letters displayed along that payline match any un-covered letters.

For example, column 4, lines 38 to 54 of Baerlocher II disclose:

[a]fter showing a simulated slot machine reel spin, the display 202 will simulate the appearance of slot machine reels that have come to rest, preferably in randomly chosen positions.

[i]f the slot machine portion 224 shows a winning combination, such as three bells aligned along one of the pay lines 228 (or other combinations defined as winning combinations 116), the computer will determine 118 whether any of the letters 232 associated with such winning pay lines match any un-covered letters from the phrase 218. If there are any matches between such letters 232 and the phrase 218, all instances of that letter in the phrase are revealed in region 218. (emphasis added)

It appears that the Office Action is interpreting the letters in the phrase (of Baerlocher II) as the component symbols (of amended independent Claim 20), and the letters displayed along the paylines (of Baerlocher II) as a set of symbols (of amended independent Claim 20). Applicant submits that because a winning combination does not appear to occur for each spin of the reels in Baerlocher II, and because the letters displayed in display 202 (and thus the letters displayed along any paylines) appear to be randomly determined for each spin of the reels in Baerlocher II, it does not appear

that the letters displayed along the paylines in Baerlocher II <u>must</u> include a letter that matches an un-covered letter from the phrase for each spin of the reels in Baerlocher II (and thus for each play of the game of Baerlocher II). That is, for each play of the game, it does not appear that the gaming system of Baerlocher II displays a set of letters (interpreted as the set of symbols of amended independent Claim 20) which includes a letter that matches an un-covered letter in the phrase (interpreted as the component symbol of amended independent Claim 20) and then selects a letter from among the displayed letters, <u>for each play of the game</u>. Thus, Applicant submits that the gaming device resulting from the combination of Dice Game, Baerlocher I, and Baerlocher II does <u>not</u> anticipate or render obvious a gaming device, wherein <u>for each play of the game,</u> if the prediction symbol does not match the selected component symbol, <u>display the symbols from the symbol set including the selected component symbol</u>, and enable the player to try to pick the selected component symbol by picking one of the displayed symbols. Moreover, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the gaming device resulting from any combination of Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, and Baerlocher II to result in such a gaming device without reasonably being construed as improper hindsight reconstruction. On the other hand, the gaming device of amended independent Claim 20 includes, amongst other elements, at least one memory device which stores a plurality of instructions, which when executed by at least one processor, cause the at least one processor to operate with at least one display device and at least one input device, <u>for each play of a game</u>, to: if the prediction symbol does not match the selected component symbol, display the symbols from the symbol set including the selected component symbol and enable the player to try to pick the selected component symbol by picking one of the displayed symbols.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 20 is patentably distinguished over Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, and Baerlocher II and is in condition for allowance.

Amended independent Claims 25, 27 and 47 each include certain similar elements to amended independent Claim 20. For reasons similar to those discussed

above with respect to amended independent Claim 20, amended independent Claims 25, 27 and 47 (and dependent Claims 21 to 24, 26 and 48 to 50) are each patentably distinguished over Dice Game, Baerlocher I, Thomas, and Baerlocher II and are in condition for allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dice Game and Baerlocher I in view of Scarne.

Scarne discloses wild cards in a poker game. More specifically, Scarne discloses that the "wild card can be used to represent any card of any suit and any denomination, even as a duplicate of a card already held by the player." Additionally Scarne discloses dealing cards face up in a Black Jack or 21 game. Specifically, Scarne discloses "[t]he dealer, starting with the player on his extreme left, begins dealing clockwise, giving one card face up to each player and one face up to himself".

Page 16 of the Office Action stated:

'369 and Dice Game lack in initially displaying one of the components numbers, but this would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in light of Scarne ("Scarne's Encyclopedia of Card Games", by John Scarne, 1973, HarperCollins, Pages 9 and 10 discussing wild cards in poker and Page 282 discussing dealing one card face up to each player and the dealer, entered as NPL 08-27-2007). Poker and blackjack are both analogous to Dice Game in that the player is attempting to obtain a winning combination of indicia. Wheel of Fortune also teaches allowing players to buy a vowel (an initial display of certain indicia in a target combination), which is analogous (http://web.archive.org/web/20040812155927/http://wheeloffortuneinfo.com/index.html). U.S. patent 5,788,573 A to the applicants (102(b)) teaches applying a game show as a bonus game in a wagering machine. The advantage of this combination would be to give the players a better chance at obtaining the winning combination of indicia, namely the correct price of the car in Dive Game.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that regardless of whether it would have been obvious to combine Dice Game, Baerlocher I, and Scarne to result in a game that initially displays one of the component numbers, neither Dice Game, Baerlocher I nor Scarne individually, nor any gaming device resulting from any combination of Dice

game, Baerlocher I, and Scarne anticipates or renders obvious a gaming device, wherein, for each play of a game, if the prediction symbol does not match the selected component symbol, display the symbols from the symbol set including the selected component symbol and enable the player to try to pick the selected component symbol by picking one of the displayed symbols. Moreover, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Dice Game and Scarne to result in such a gaming device without reasonably being construed as improper hindsight reconstruction. On the other hand, Claim 24 includes, amongst other elements, at least one memory device which stores a plurality of instructions, which when executed by at least one processor, cause the at least one processor to operate with at least one display device and at least one input device, for each play of a game, to: if the prediction symbol does not match the selected component symbol, display the symbols from the symbol set including the selected component symbol and enable the player to try to pick the selected component symbol by picking one of the displayed symbols.. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 24 is patentably distinguished over Dice Game, Baerlocher I, and Scarne and is in condition for allowance.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance and in the absence of more pertinent art such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY *Adam H Masia*

      Adam H. Masia
      Reg. No. 35,602
      Customer No. 29,159
      (312) 807-4284

Dated: January 12, 2009